DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 053 EC 115 262

AUTHOR Davis, William J.; And Others
TITLE A Role Theory Perspective of the System of Delivering Services to Exceptional Children: Mesa Public Schools.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Convention, The Council for Exceptional Children (57th, Dallas, Texas, April 22-27, 1979, Session W-42)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Delivery Systems; *Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Exceptional Child Research; Exceptional Child Services; *Handicapped Children; *Role Perception; *Special Education; Statistical Data; Surveys

ABSTRACT

The paper presents results of a needs assessment survey, involving 112 public school personnel, conducted to facilitate staff development programs aimed at furthering the integration of the roles of general and special education administrators. It is explained that the survey instrument, the Task-Role-Involvement Inventory, had two purposes--to describe the perceived actual and desired systems of delivering services to exceptional children in terms of the assignment of key tasks to organizational roles and to identify, if any, those task role assignments about which system personnel disagree or do not like. Statistical data are reported for actual task role assignment, extent of agreement on actual task role assignment, satisfaction with the actual assignment of tasks to roles, role of the principal in the delivery of services to exceptional children, and satisfaction with the perceived actual level of involvement. (SBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED171053

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A ROLE THEORY PERSPECTIVE OF THE SYSTEM OF DELIVERING SERVICES TO EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN: MESA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

William J. Davis
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Brent E. Wholeben
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Norman Ellis
University Council for Educational Administration

Written
July, 1978

Council for Exceptional Children
Dallas, Texas
April 23-27, 1979

EC115262

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CEC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
A.	Introduction	1
B.	Description of the Survey Instrument	3
C.	Sample Description	10
D.	Analysis of the Task-Force-Involvement Inventory	11
	I. Actual Task-Role Assignment.	11
	II. Extent of Agreement on Actual Task-Role Assignment	14
	III. Desired Task-Role Assignment	16
	IV. Extent of Agreement on Desired Task-Role Assignment.	19
	V. Satisfaction With the Actual Assignment of Tasks to Roles.	21
	VI. The Role of the Principal in the Delivery of Services to Exceptional Children.	23
	VII. Satisfaction with the Perceived Actual Level of Involvement.	29

A. Introduction

A survey of the Education Commission of the States in 1974 revealed that special education was perceived by governors to be the number one challenge to the states. Since the 1974 survey, numerous states have mandated wide-sweeping changes in programs for exceptional children and a dramatic federal law (P.L. 94-142) has come into being.

It is clear that if the changes now underway are to come to effective fruition, educational leaders and school staff will play new and important roles. There are two key strands of formal leadership in school systems. On the one hand, there are directors of exceptional education and associated personnel, while on the other, there are school superintendents, associate superintendents, and school principals. There has not always been a common understanding between general and special education leaders. Nor have the objectives and effects of these two types of leadership been always well integrated and coordinated. Now, however, this situation must change. The roles of the special and general education leaders must become integrated in the sense that the same language is spoken, that both parties are pursuing similar goals through similar means, and that there is a mutual understanding and acceptance of the new responsibilities and obligations attached to all positions within the school system hierarchy.

One viable approach to bringing about this integration and coordination of efforts is well designed staff development opportunities for administrators and other staff. But staff development programs cannot be well designed unless the needs and current status of the school system

are made known. Simply put, needs assessment efforts and status reporting are typically the first steps taken in planning effective staff development programs.

The present paper records select results of a needs assessment survey that was specifically conducted to assist the development of staff development programs aimed at furthering the integration of the roles of general and special education administrators. Taking role theory as its conceptual base, the survey generated a massive amount of data regarding the actual and desired assignment of special education tasks to organizational roles (positions). Because of the massive amount of data generated, the present paper records data relevant to only a small sample of the pertinent questions that might be asked. Because of the unique characteristics of the special education delivery systems found in school districts, the emphasis of the paper is to instruct local school personnel in how to interpret the data recorded herein rather than to attempt an ill-equipped interpretation of that data.

Recognizing that the interpretation of data is complex and that school systems may desire further analysis of specific relations within the data set, the authors are prepared and more than willing to undertake these activities upon request.*

---

* For further information contact Dr. Ellen Herda, Director of the SAGE Project, University Council for Educational Administration, 29 W. Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210 (614-422-2564).

B. Description of the Survey Instrument

The survey instrument, the Task-Role-Involvement Inventory, had two purposes: (a) to describe the perceived actual and desired systems of delivering services to exceptional children in terms of the assignment of key tasks to organizational roles; and (b) to identify, if any, those task-role assignments about which system personnel disagree or do not like.

The Task-Role-Involvement Inventory is underguided by role theory, one of the major theories of organizational behavior to have emerged over the years. Grossly oversimplified, role theory asserts that the greater the agreement among the organizational membership as to who should be doing what, the greater will the organization be administratively efficient and most likely effective. In other words, if certain organizational tasks are not clearly understood to be assigned to some particular role(s) then the probability increases that these tasks will remain undone or be undertaken by several independently acting parties. As well as resulting in duplicated effort and/or a lack of organizational responsiveness, ambiguity in the assignment of tasks to roles increases the potential for frustration, conflict, and jurisdictional disputes.

The key concept of role theory, then, is congruence--congruence among the organizational membership in identifying who is doing what, who should be doing what, what I am doing, what I would like

to be doing, and what others think I am doing and would like me to do. Quite clearly, there are many different types of congruence, each having the potential to result in role confusion and ultimately role conflict. The purpose of the Task-Role-Involvement Inventory is to assist school system's in identifying those tasks and/or roles in their system of delivery services to exceptional children which, because of their ambiguous nature, are potential sources of role conflict and system malfunction.

More specifically, the Task-Role-Involvement Inventory asks four questions about 29 tasks related to the delivery of special educational services:

1. What person or persons are primarily responsible at the present time for performing this task?
2. Which person or persons do you believe should be primarily responsible for performing the task?
3. What is the present nature of your involvement in relation to this task?
4. What do you believe should be the nature of your involvement in relation to this task?

The response options for the first two of these questions are seven* major roles (positions) found in school systems:

1. Superintendent
2. Assistant or Associate Superintendent
3. School Building Principal**
4. Special Education Director
5. Central Office or Area Special Education Consultant
6. Special Education Teacher
7. General Education Teacher.

---

*A category designated as "Other" was also provided along with the request that respondents specify the precise role (position) of their response choice.

**The questionnaire actually contained the response options of Elementary Principal, Secondary Principal, and Middle or Junior High Principal. To avoid reaching erroneous conclusions by failing to properly aggregate these similar response options, the categories were collapsed for all analytical uses.

The response options to questions #3 and #4 represent several points on a presumed continuum of involvement in performing a task:

1. No involvement
2. Providing relevant information/serving in an advisory capacity.
3. Deciding who will perform the task and/or how the task will be performed.
4. Deciding, in cooperation with others, how the task will be performed.
5. Performing the task.
6. Supervising the performance of the task.
7. Approving or disapproving the outcome of the task.

As mentioned, the four criterion questions were asked with respect to each of 29 tasks associated with the delivery of services to exceptional children. Each of the 29 tasks, which are listed as Table C.1, were seen, to greater or lesser extent, as being required by P.L. 94-142. The set of tasks was assembled by Dr. Clifford Howe of the University of Iowa.

The content validity of the set of 29 tasks was assessed by a panel of experts including school system, university, and professional agency personnel. After slight modification of the original list, the set of tasks was accepted by the panel as being relevant and valid.

TABLE C.1*

TASKS RELATED TO THE DELIVERY OF SERVICES TO EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

1. Determines procedures to be used in identification, location, and evaluation of handicapped children.
2. Designs format for Individualized Educational Programs.
3. Functions as chairperson of Placement or Staffing Committee for assignment ofohandicapped children to programs.
4. Reviews initial referral of child to determine whether child should be evaluated for special education services.
5. Obtains parent permission to conduct evaluation of child.
6. Determines persons to be included in staffing or placement committee.
7. Assigns responsibilities to various committee members for evaluation of child.
8. Insures that due process procedures are followed.
9. Responsible for the final decision for determining eligibility of child for special education services.
10. Assigns child to appropriate special education program.
11. Informs receiving special education teacher of child to be admitted to his/her program.
12. Responsible for seeing that an appropriate individualized educational program is developed.
13. Insures that placement of the child is in the least restrictive environment.
14. Obtains parent permission for placement.
15. Sees that a written record is kept of all decisions made.
16. Is responsible for monitoring the individualized educational plan which is written for a child.
17. Responsible to see that the individual educational program is reviewed at least annually.
18. Evaluates effectiveness of individual educational program.
19. Evaluates effectiveness of the district wide program for handicapped children.

TABLE C.1 continued

20. Sees that appropriate materials are available to the teacher for instruction.

21. Evaluates the special education teacher for purposes of improvement, tenure, or dismissal.

22. Supervises the instructional program for a special education teacher.

23. Determines the teaching methods to be used in a special education classroom or program.

24. Selects and employ new teachers for the special education program.

25. Allocates physical space for the special education program.

26. Handles grievances of the special education program.

27. Coordinates the special education program with the regular educational program at the building level.

28. Disseminates information about the special education program to the community and other interested publics.

29. Handles grievances of the parents of special education students.

*Throughout the remainder of the paper, each task is designated by the number assigned to it in the following list. For the reader's convience in working with the forthcoming tables of data, a copy of the list of tables is affixed to the back cover of the report.

As is seen, the Task-Role-Involvement Inventory assesses two major dimensions of possible role ambiguity: (a) the assignment of tasks to roles, and (b) the level of task involvement of various roles in the school system. Each dimension is queried in both the real and ideal sense--that is, with respect to the actual state of functioning as perceived by the survey respondents and the desired state. While the four variables of the study--the perceived actual task-role assignment, the desired task-role assignment, the actual level of involvement, and the desired level of involvement--can be meaningfully compiled and contrasted in a multitude of ways, the present report restricts itself to consideration of the following eleven basic issues:

1. Which role (position) within the school system hierarchy is presently seen as being primarily responsible for the accomplishment of each task? (Section D.I)

2. To what degree do the survey respondents agree as to which role presently bears primary responsibility for the accomplishment of each task? (Section D.II)

3. In the opinion of the survey respondents, which role should bear primary responsibility for the accomplishment of each task? (Section D.III)

4. To what degree to the survey respondents agree as to which role should bear primary responsibility for the accomplishment of each task? (Section D.IV)

5. To what extent are the survey respondents satisfied with the present assignments of tasks to roles as they see these tasks being assigned? (Section D.V)

6. What level of involvement do principals see themselves as presently having in the accomplishment of each of the tasks? (Section D.VI)

7. Do principals, among themselves, agree as to their present level of involvement in the accomplishment of each of the tasks? (Section D.VI)

8. What level of involvement do principals think they should have in the accomplishment of each of the tasks? (Section D.VI)

9. Do principals, among themselves, agree as to what their level of involvement should be in the accomplishment of each of the tasks? (Section D.VI)

10. To what extent are principals satisfied with their present levels of involvement in the accomplishment of each of the tasks? (Section D.VII)

11. To what extent are all survey respondents satisfied with their present level of involvement in the accomplishment of each of the tasks? (Section D.VII)

C. Sample Description

One hundred and twelve usable responses were received from Mesa Public School personnel.* Table C.1 reveals the distribution of survey respondents by position. As is seen, the Mesa sample was predominated by Special Education Teachers (40.1% of all respondents), Counselors/Psychologists**(36.6%), and Principals (20.6%). Thirteen of the 112 Mesa survey respondents had not attended a SAGE or special education training session; 88.4% did so attend.

TABLE C.1

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY POSITION

Position	Number of Respondents	Percent of Total
Superintendent	0	0.0%
Assistant or Associate Superintendent	1	0.4%
Principal	23	20.6%
Special Education Director	0	0.0%
Central Office or Area Special Educ. Consult.	2	1.8%
Special Education Teacher	45	40.1%
General Education Teacher	0	0.0%
Psychologists/Counselors**	41	36.6%
Total	112	100.0%

*Due to the fact that each SAGE unit selected its own sample and administered the data collection process, the survey response rate cannot be calculated by the author.

**Lack of foresight in the construction of the survey instrument resulted in the omission of response options for counselors and psychologists. The figures reported here and elsewhere in the report under the heading "Counselors/Psychologists" were actually recorded in the "Other" category on the survey instrument. Analysis of written responses revealed that nearly all "Others" were counselors or psychologists. The figures are slightly inflated, however, by the admission of certain other personnel such as nurses to this category.

D. Analysis of the Task-Role-Involvement Inventory

I. Actual Task-Role Assignment

(Which role-position within the school system hierarchy is presently seen as bearing primary responsibility for the accomplishment of each task?)

Respondents were asked to identify which person or persons (i.e., role position) are primarily responsible for performing each of the 29 tasks. For each task, the responses were tabulated by role; The results of this tabulation are presented in Table D.1. Table D.2, on the other hand, summarizes the results of the tabulation by recording (among other things) the "Most Frequently Cited Role" for each task. Consideration of the set of most frequently selected roles of perceived actual responsibility takes on added meaning when compared to the corresponding set of roles as designated by the school district's plan for the delivery of services to exceptional children. Departure from the school district plan implies one or a combination of several possible situations among which are the following:

1. The school district plan has not been fully articulated (with respect to the tasks under question) to school system personnel. Lack of precise knowledge as to who should be doing what has led members of the role most frequently selected by the survey respondents as having primary responsibility to accept the responsibility for the task.

2. The survey respondents are mistaken in their perceptions of actual task role assignment.

3. The school district plan did not meet with the approval of certain organizational members who subsequently modified it in practice.

TABLE D.1

ACTUAL TASK-ROLE ASSIGNMENT: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS
(N=112)

Task	Supt.	As.Supt.	Princ.	Spec. Educ. Direct.	Cent. Spec. Educ. Direct.	Spec. Educ. Tchrs.	Gen. Educ. Tchrs.	Counselors/ Psychologists
1	2.7	5.4	2.7	36.0	8.1	9.0	9.0	25.2
2	0.9	2.7	0.0	23.4	26.1	23.4	0.0	18.9
3	0.0	0.0	9.9	1.8	5.4	11.7	0.9	69.4
4	0.0	0.0	8.1	0.0	2.7	13.5	0.9	73.0
5	0.0	0.9	1.8	0.0	0.9	4.5	55.9	35.1
6	0.0	2.7	7.2	14.4	8.1	6.3	0.0	61.3
7	0.0	0.0	12.6	4.5	0.9	1.8	0.9	77.5
8	0.9	2.7	10.8	6.3	5.4	1.8	0.0	71.2
9	0.9	1.8	5.4	6.3	6.3	2.7	0.9	73.0
10	0.0	0.9	4.6	11.8	18.2	2.7	0.0	60.9
11	0.0	0.0	1.8	4.5	28.8	1.8	0.0	60.4
12	0.0	0.0	5.4	3.6	4.5	25.9	0.0	58.6
13	0.9	0.9	9.8	6.3	5.4	4.5	0.0	69.6
14	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	2.7	1.8	11.8	81.8
15	0.0	0.8	4.5	1.8	3.6	20.7	0.0	66.7
16	0.0	0.0	0.9	4.5	22.5	53.2	0.0	18.9
17	0.0	0.0	0.9	7.2	9.9	24.3	0.0	57.7
18	0.0	0.0	0.9	7.2	15.3	47.8	0.9	27.9
19	8.1	12.6	0.0	45.1	19.8	3.6	0.9	7.2
20	1.8	3.6	10.0	16.4	51.8	10.0	0.0	4.6
21	0.0	0.9	31.8	21.8	41.8	0.9	0.0	1.8
22	0.0	0.0	6.4	20.0	66.4	2.7	0.0	0.9
23	0.0	1.8	0.0	20.0	30.9	43.6	0.0	1.8
24	0.0	0.9	18.2	36.4	33.6	5.5	0.0	2.7
25	4.6	6.4	60.9	13.6	7.3	0.9	0.0	2.7
26	2.7	10.7	13.4	42.9	18.8	3.6	0.0	6.3
27	0.9	4.5	50.0	0.8	7.1	26.8	0.0	8.0
28	8.0	6.3	10.7	38.4	24.1	4.5	0.0	3.6
29	2.7	17.0	20.5	25.9	13.4	8.0	0.0	8.9

TABLE D.2

EXTENT OF AGREEMENT ON ACTUAL TASK-ROLE ASSIGNMENT: SUMMARY

Task	Most Freq. Cited Role		Next Most Freq. Cited Role		Number of Roles Cited
	Role	%			
1.	Spec. Educ. Direct.	36.0	Couns./Psych.	25.2	2
2.	Cent. Educ. Direct	26.1	Spec. Educ. Direct. Spec. Educ. Tchr.	23.4	4
3.	Couns./Psych.	69.4	Spec. Educ. Tchr	11.7	2
4.	Couns./Psych.	73.0	Spec. Educ. Tchr	13.5	2
5.	Gen. Educ. Tchr	55.9	Couns/Psych.	35.1	2
6.	Couns./Psych.	61.3	Spec. Educ. Direct	14.4	2
7.	Couns./Psych.	77.5	Princ.	12.6	2
8.	Couns./Psych.	71.2		10.8	2
9.	Couns./Psych.	73.0	Spec. Educ. Direct. Cent. Educ. Direct	6.3	1
10.	Couns./Psych.	60.9	Cent. Educ. Direct.	18.2	3
11.	Couns./Psych.	60.4	Cent. Educ. Direct.	28.8	2
12.	Couns./Psych.	58.6	Spec. Educ. Tchr	27.9	2
13.	Couns./Psych.	69.6	Prin.	9.8	1
14.	Couns./Psych.	81.8	Gen Educ. Tchr.	11.8	2
15.	Couns./Psych.	66.7	Spec. Educ. Tchr.	20.7	2
16.	Spec. Educ. Tchr	53.2	Cent. Educ. Direct.	22.5	3
17.	Couns./Psych.	57.7	Spec. Educ. Tchr.	24.3	2
18.	Spec. Educ. Tchr	47.3	Couns./Psych.	28.6	3
19.	Spec. Educ. Direct.	44.6	Cent. Educ. Direct	19.6	3
20.	Cent. Educ. Direct	50.9	Spec. Educ. Direct.	16.1	4
21.	Cent. Educ. Direct	41.1	Prin.	31.8	3
22.	Cent. Educ. Direct	65.2	Spec. Educ. Direct	19.6	2
23.	Spec. Educ. Tchr.	42.9	Cent Educ Direct.	30.4	3
24.	Spec. Educ. Direct.	35.7	Cent. Educ. Direct.	33.0	3
25.	Princ.	60.9	Spec. Educ. Direct.	13.6	2
26.	Spec. Educ. Direct.	42.9	Cent. Educ. Direct.	18.8	4
27.	Princ.	50.0	Spec. Educ. Tchr.	26.8	2
28.	Spec. Educ. Direct.	38.4	Cent. Educ. Direct.	24.1	3
29.	Spec. Educ. Direct.	25.9	Prin.	25.9	4

II. Extent of Agreement on Actual Task-Role Assignment

(To what degree do the survey respondents agree as to which roles presently bears primary responsibility for the accomplishment of each task?)

Role theory would have it that the greater the organizational membership agrees as to who (what role) is doing what, the more smoothly will the organization operate. Conversely, the more disagreement among the organizational membership, the more likely it would be that tasks are not undertaken or undertaken simultaneously (and inefficiently) by several parties: such occurrances might well precipitate subordinate frustration, role conflict, and jurisdictional disputes.

Table D.2 presents three measures which, taken in combination, assess the extent of agreement among the survey respondents as to who (what role) actually bears primary responsibility for performing each of the 29 tasks. The most obvious measure of agreement is the percentage of the sample who selected the "Most Frequently Cited Role." The higher this percentage, the more agreement evidenced among the survey respondents. However, this figure alone does not tell the full story for it provides no insight into the observations of all those who disagreed with the modal selection. Quite different implications are in order, for example, if the remaining respondents agree among themselves upon a single role than if they spread their votes among several roles.* A fuller picture of the extent of agreement

*The nomination of several roles tends to imply confusion among the respondents (and hence possibly within the delivery system itself) as to who is doing what; the predominant selection of two roles, on the other hand, tends to support itself as an accurate assertion and implies concern over future conflict between the two roles as to who has primary responsibility for the task in question.

on actual task-role assignment is thus obtained by contrasting (a) the percentage of respondents who selected the "Most Frequently Cited Role," (b) the percentage of respondents who selected the "Next Most Frequently Cited Role," and (c) the "Number of Roles Cited" by an arbitrarily significant percentage** of respondents. These figures are presented for each of the 29 tasks in Table D.2

**For no scientific reason, 10% of the sample was considered to be a significant percentage. This figure was used in generating Table D.2. The entries of Table D.1 permit the reader to modify this decision rule.

III. Desired Task-Role Assignment

(In the opinion of the survey respondents, which role should bear primary responsibility for the accomplishment of each task?)

Respondents were asked to identify which person or persons (i.e., role position) should be given primary responsibility for performing each of the 29 tasks. For each task, the responses were tabulated by role; the results of the tabulation are presented in Table D.3. Table D.3 summarizes the results of the tabulation by recording (among other things) the "Most Frequently Cited Role" for each task. As with the analysis of the Actual Task-Role Assignment, consideration of the set of most frequently selected roles of desired responsibility takes on added meaning when compared to the school district's plan for delivering services to exceptional children. In this case, however, departure from the school district's plan implies disapproval of the plan by the survey respondents. Disapproval may have resulted from lack of knowledge or disagreement with the goals of the plan, disagreement with the optimal means of implementing the plan, or such other idiosyncratic factors as the personalities and styles of certain role encumbents.

TABLE D.3

DESIRED TASK-ROLE ASSIGNMENT: PERCENTAGE DISTRUBTION OF RESPONSES
(N=112)

Task	Supt.	Asst Supt.	Princ.	Spec. Educ. Direct	Cent. Spec. Educ. Direct.	Spec. Educ. Tehrs.	Cen. Educ. Tchrs.	Counselors/ Psychologists
1	1.8	5.4	3.6	36.0	7.2	5.4	9.0	31.5
2	0.0	1.8	1.8	24.3	23.4	24.3	2.7	18.0
3	0.9	0.0	11.7	0.9	3.6	12.6	0.9	68.5
4	0.9	0.0	9.9	1.8	2.7	12.6	0.0	71.2
5	0.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	1.8	5.4	52.3	35.1
6	0.0	2.7	9.9	17.1	7.2	2.7	0.0	59.5
7	0.0	0.0	16.2	5.4	0.9	0.0	0.9	74.8
8	1.8	4.5	20.7	5.4	5.4	1.8	0.0	59.5
9	1.8	1.8	8.1	5.4	7.2	2.7	0.9	68.5
10	0.9	0.0	5.5	11.8	15.5	2.7	0.9	61.8
11	0.0	0.0	4.5	4.5	29.7	0.9	0.9	56.8
12	0.0	0.0	10.8	3.6	4.5	28.8	0.0	52.3
13	0.8	1.8	14.3	7.1	5.4	6.3	0.0	62.5
14	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.9	1.8	4.6	10.0	78.2
15	0.9	0.0	10.8	1.8	5.4	14.4	0.0	64.9
16	0.0	0.0	0.9	3.6	22.5	53.2	0.0	19.8
17	0.0	0.0	1.8	4.5	9.9	28.8	0.0	54.1
18	0.0	0.0	5.4	7.2	13.5	46.0	1.8	26.1
19	8.1	13.5	0.9	42.3	20.7	6.3	0.0	5.4
20	1.8	2.7	12.7	15.5	50.0	10.0	0.0	4.6
21	0.0	1.8	34.5	19.1	39.1	0.9	0.0	2.7
22	0.0	0.0	10.0	19.1	61.8	2.7	0.0	1.8
23	0.0	0.0	0.9	19.1	29.1	46.4	0.0	1.8
24	0.0	1.8	23.6	33.6	31.8	7.6	0.0	2.7
25	3.6	7.3	58.2	13.6	9.1	1.8	0.0	2.7
26	2.7	10.7	14.3	43.8	17.9	2.7	0.0	6.3
27	1.8	2.7	53.6	0.9	6.3	24.1	0.9	7.1
28	8.9	5.4	9.8	35.7	25.0	6.3	0.0	3.6
29	3.6	16.1	22.3	24.1	14.3	8.9	0.0	7.1

TABLE D.4

EXTENT OF AGREEMENT ON DESIRED TASK-ROLE ASSIGNMENT: SUMMARY

Task	Most.Freq. Cited Role		Next Most. Freq. Cited Role		Number of Roles Cited
	Role	%	Role	%	
1.	Spec. Educ. Direct.	35.7	Couns./Psych.	32.1	2
2.	Spec. Educ. Tchr.	25.0	Spec. Educ. Direct.	24.1	4
3.	Couns./Psych.	68.8	Spec. Educ. Tchr.	12.5	3
4.	Couns./Psych.	71.4	Spec. Educ. Tchr.	12.5	2
5.	Gen. Educ. Tchr.	51.8	Couns./Psych.	35.7	2
6.	Couns./Psych.	59.8	Spec. Educ. Direct.	17.0	2
7.	Couns./Psych.	75.0	Princ.	16.2	2
8.	Couns./Psych.	59.8	Princ.	20.7	2
9.	Couns./Psych.	68.8	Princ.	8.1	1
10.	Couns./Psych.	60.7	Cent. Educ. Direct.	15.2	3
11.	Couns./Psych.	57.1	Cent. Educ. Direct.	29.5	2
12.	Couns./Psych.	51.8	Spec. Educ. Tchr.	29.5	3
13.	Couns./Psych.	62.5	Princ.	14.3	2
14.	Couns./Psych.	77.7	Gen. Educ. Tchr	9.8	2
15.	Couns./Psych.	64.3	Spec. Educ. Tchr.	14.3	3
16.	Spec. Educ. Tchr.	52.7	Cent. Educ. Direct.	22.3	3
17.	Couns./Psych.	53.6	Spec. Educ. Tchr.	28.6	2
18.	Spec. Educ. Tchr.	46.0	Couns./Psych.	26.1	3
19.	Spec. Educ. Direct.	42.3	Cent. Educ. Direct.	20.7	3
20.	Cent. Educ. Direct.	50.0	Spec. Educ. Direct.	15.5	4
21.	Cent. Educ. Direct.	39.1	Princ.	34.5	3
22.	Cent. Educ. Direc.	61.8	Spec. Educ. Direct.	19.1	3
23.	Spec. Educ. Tchr.	46.4	Cent. Educ. Direct	29.1	3
24.	Spec. Educ. Direct	33.6	Cent. Educ. Direct.	31.8	3
25.	Princ.	58.2	Spec. Educ. Direct.	13.6	2
26.	Spec. Educ. Direct.	43.8	Cent. Educ. Direct.	13.9	3
27.	Princ.	53.6	Spec. Educ. Tchr.	24.1	2
28.	Spec. Educ. Direct.	35.7	Cent. Educ. Direct.	25.0	2
29.	Spec. Educ. Direct.	24.1	Princ.	22.3	3

IV. Extent of Agreement on Desired Task-Role Assignment

(To what degree do the survey respondents agree as to which role should bear primary responsibility for the accomplishment of each task?)

Role theory is also concerned with the relationship between system performance and the extent of agreement among organizational members as to who should be doing what. Here, however, the relationship predicted by role theory is more complex than was the case in describing perceived present responsibilities. For while disagreement among the membership is still seen as potentially dysfunctional, complete unanimity does not necessarily lead to smooth system performance. In this latter case, the critical test is whether the desired state of affairs is presently being implemented or at least not being denied by matters within the control of the school system. Quite simply, if there is complete agreement over what the school system should be doing but this view is not being accommodated, then it becomes distinctly possible that the staff will become dissatisfied and perform their tasks with less than maximum efficiency and effectiveness.

The degree of congruence between the actual and desired assignment of tasks to roles is addressed in the next section of the report; the present discussion is limited to describing the extent of agreement among the survey respondents as to how tasks should be assigned to roles in the delivery of services to exceptional children.

In its own right, the extent of agreement among the survey respondents as to how roles should be assigned to tasks is an important measure of potential system performance. For if opinion is severely split among several roles, then it can be predicted that:

1. All efforts to modify the system will be met with less than resounding enthusiasm (unless the underlying beliefs of the staff are modified beforehand).
2. The individuals currently performing the tasks may receive less than a full share of respect and support for their efforts.

The extent of agreement on desired task-role assignment is diagnosed in the same fashion as was the extent of agreement on actual task-role assignment (see Section II). With respect to each of the 29 tasks, Table D.4 displays: (a) the percentage of respondents who selected the "Most Frequently Cited Role," (b) the percentage of respondents who selected the "Next Most Frequently Selected Role," and (c) the "Number of Roles Cited" by an arbitrarily significant percentage of respondents. As earlier, the extent of agreement among the respondents is assessed by contrasting these three figures.

V. Satisfaction With the Actual Assignment of Tasks to Roles

(To what extent are the survey respondents satisfied with the present assignments of tasks to roles as they see these tasks being assigned?)

As mentioned in the previous section, a critical determination in regard to the stability and performance of an organization is the degree to which the organizational membership is satisfied with the present system of allocation between tasks and roles. One indicator of the degree of such satisfaction is the percentage of individuals who selected the same role as being the one which ought to perform and which is performing a given task. If this percentage figure is high for a particular task, then one senses that there is little desire on the part of the organizational membership to change the current state of affairs. In inteppreting the percentage, however, it is crucial to realize that it is a measure of satisfaction with the present system as each respondent sees that system to be presently operating. The percentage figure does not signify whether these views are similar or vastly different among the respondents.*

The degree of satisfaction with the perceived actual assignment of tasks to roles is recorded for each of the 29 tasks in Table D.5 which follows.

---

*The extent of agreement among participants is covered in Sections II and IV of this report.

TABLE D.5

STAFF SATISFACTION WITH PERCEIVED ACTUAL TASK-ROLE ASSIGNMENT

Task	Percent of Respondents Who Selected the Same Role as Being Both Desired and Actual	Task	Percent of Respondents Who Selected the Same Role as Being Both Desired and Actual
1.	84.5%	16.	95.5%
2.	81.1%	17.	88.3%
3.	88.2%	18.	86.5%
4.	91.7%	19.	91.7%
5.	92.7%	20.	91.7%
6.	86.5%	21.	88.1%
7.	88.1%	22.	92.5%
8.	82.7%	23.	92.6%
9.	89.8%	24.	85.0%
10.	90.8%	25.	87.7%
11.	89.8%	26.	90.9%
12.	87.4%	27.	93.6%
13.	85.3%	28.	91.6%
14.	91.7%	29.	91.7%
15.	85.3%		

VI. The Role of the Principal in the Delivery of Services to Exceptional Children

(What level of involvement do principals see themselves as presently having in the accomplishment of each task? Do the principals agree among themselves as to their actual level of involvement? What level of involvement do they desire? Do they agree among themselves in this assessment?)

Respondents were asked to assess the present and desired nature (level) of their involvement in relation to each of the 29 tasks by selecting one of seven response options:

1. No involvement. (No Involve)
2. Providing relevant information/serving in an advisory capacity. (Inform and Advise)
3. Deciding who will perform the task and/or how the task will be performed. (Decide Who/How)
4. Deciding, in cooperation with others, how the task will be performed. (Coop-Decide)
5. Performing the Task. (Perform Task)
6. Supervising the Performance of the Task. (Supervise)
7. Approving or disapproving the outcome of the task. (Approve Outcome)

Due to the presumed importance of the role of the principal in the delivery of all educational services and the linking agent role which principals must play under the guildeines of P.L. 94-142, this role was singled out for critical observation and analysis. In all, 23 principals from Mesa responded to the study.

The role of the principal in the delivery of services to exceptional children can be described, analyzed, and interpreted in directly analogous fashion to the procedures already described with respect to the assignment of tasks to roles. As such the analytical and interpretive paradigms are now but briefly reiterated.

1. Table D.6 describes the perceived actual level of involvement of principals by recording the percentage distribution of respondents across the seven response options. Table D.7 summarizes Table D.6 and may be used to observe: (a) the actual level of involvement which most principals see themselves as having; and (b) the extent of agreement among principals as to their actual level of involvement. The former estimation takes on added meaning when compared to the school district's plan for how principals should be involved in the special education delivery system.

2. Table D.8 describes the desired level of involvement of principals by recording the percentage distribution of respondents across the seven response options. Table D.9 summarizes Table D.8 and may be used to observe: (a) the level of involvement which most principals would like to have (i.e., the desired level of involvement most frequently cited by the principals); and (b) the extent of agreement among the principals as to their desired level of involvement.

TABLE D.6

ACTUAL LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT (PRINCIPAL): PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
(N=23)

Task	No Involv.	Inform. and Advise	Decide Whó/ How	Coop Decide	Perform Task	Super-vise	Approve Outcome
1	8.7	30.4	4.4	21.7	0.0	26.1	8.7
2	43.5	17.4	0.0	13.0	0.0	13.0	13.0
3	13.0	30.4	0.0	39.1	8.7	4.4	4.4
4	17.4	47.8	4.4	8.7	0.0	17.4	4.4
5	21.7	34.8	8.7	0.0	4.4	30.4	0.0
6	34.8	39.1	4.4	4.4	8.7	8.7	0.0
7	30.4	30.4	13.0	8.7	4.4	8.7	0.0
8	13.0	17.4	0.0	8.7	17.4	39.1	4.4
9	17.4	52.2	0.0	21.8	0.0	8.7	0.0
10	13.0	39.1	0.0	30.4	0.0	17.4	0.0
11	39.1	26.1	0.0	4.4	0.0	26.1	4.4
12	13.0	34.8	0.0	26.1	8.7	13.0	4.4
13	13.0	30.4	0.0	39.1	8.7	8.7	0.0
14	43.5	8.7	8.7	4.4	4.4	26.1	4.4
15	26.1	17.4	4.4	17.4	8.7	21.7	4.4
16	39.1	13.0	0.0	4.4	0.0	30.4	13.0
17	34.8	17.4	8.7	8.7	0.0	26.1	4.4
18	39.1	21.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	39.1	0.0
19	52.2	39.1	0.0	0.0	4.4	4.4	0.0
20	21.7	34.8	8.7	4.4	26.1	4.4	0.0
21	17.4	8.7	4.4	13.0	39.1	13.0	44.4
22	26.1	26.1	0.0	8.7	8.7	17.4	13.0
23	30.4	34.8	0.0	4.4	0.0	26.1	4.4
24	13.0	13.0	0.0	26.1	39.1	4.4	4.4
25	8.7	17.4	0.0	17.4	52.2	4.4	0.0
26	17.4	30.4	4.4	13.0	34.8	0.0	0.0
27	8.7	13.0	0.0	30.4	47.8	0.0	0.0
28	34.8	34.8	4.4	8.7	13.0	4.4	0.0
29	21.7	34.8	0.0	17.4	26.1	0.0	0.0

TABLE D.7

THE EXTENT OF AGREEMENT ON ACTUAL LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT (PRINCIPAL): SUMMARY

Task	Most Freq. Cited Level of Involvement		Next Most Freq. Cited Level of Involvement		Number of Levels Cited (10%)
	Level	%	Level		
1	Inform & Advise	30.4%	Supervise	26.1%	3
2	No Involve.	43.5%	Inform & Advise	17.4%	5
3	Coop-Decide	39.1%	Inform & Advise	30.4%	3
4	Inform & Advise	47.8%	No Involve Supervise	17.4%	3
5	Inform & Advise	34.8%	Supervise	30.4%	3
6	Inform & Advise	39.1%	No Involve	34.8%	2
7	No Involve Inform & Advise	30.4%	Decide Who/How	13.0%	3
8	Supervise	39.1%	Inform & Advise Perform Task	17.4%	4
9	Inform & Advise	52.2%	Coop-Decide	21.8%	3
10	Inform & Advise	39.1%	Coop-Decide	30.4%	4
11	No Involv	39.1%	Inform & Advise Supervise	26.1%	3
12	Inform & Advise	34.8%	Coop-Decide	26.1%	4
13	Coop-Decide	39.1%	Inform & Advise	30.4%	3
14	No Involv	43.5%	Supervise	26.1%	2
15	No Involv	26.1%	Supervise	21.7%	4
16	No Involve	39.1%	Supervise	30.4%	4
17	No Involve	34.8%	Supervise	26.1%	3
18	No Involve Supervise	39.1%	Inform & Advise	21.7%	3
19	No Involve	52.2	Inform & Advise	39.1%	2
20	Inform & Advise	34.8%	Perform Task	26.1%	3
21	PerformaTask	39.1%	No Involve	17.4%	4
22	No Involve Inform & Advise	26.1%	Supervise	17.4%	4
23	Inform & Advise	34.8%	No Involve	30.4%	3
24	Perform Task	39.1%	Coop-Decide	26.1%	4
25	Perform Task	52.2%	Inform & Advise Coop-Decide	17.4%	3
26	Perform Task	34.8%	Inform & Advise	30.4%	4
27	Perform Task	47.8%	Coop-Decide	30.4%	3
28	No Involve Inform & Advise	34.8%	Perform Task	13.0%	3
29	Inform & Advise	34.8%	Perform Task	26.1%	4

TABLE D.8

DESIRED LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT (PRINCIPAL): PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
(N=23)

Task	No Involv.	Inform. and Advise	Decide Who/ How	Coop Decide	Perform Task	Super-vise	Approve Outcome
1	4.4	30.4	8.7	21.7	0.0	30.4	4.4
2	34.8	21.7	0.0	17.4	0.0	17.4	8.7
3	13.0	30.4	0.0	30.4	4.4	8.7	13.0
4	13.0	52.2	0.0	8.7	0.0	13.0	13.0
5	21.7	34.8	8.7	0.0	4.4	21.7	8.7
6	30.4	39.1	4.4	8.7	8.7	4.4	4.4
7	26.1	26.1	17.4	8.7	4.4	8.7	4.4
8	13.0	13.0	0.0	4.4	21.7	43.5	4.4
9	13.0	43.5	0.0	26.1	0.0	8.7	8.7
10	13.0	30.4	0.0	26.1	0.0	17.4	8.7
11	26.1	17.4	0.0	4.4	0.0	21.7	21.7
12	8.7	30.4	0.0	21.7	8.7	17.4	13.0
13	13.0	21.7	0.0	39.1	8.7	8.7	8.7
14	39.1	8.7	8.7	4.4	4.4	17.4	17.4
15	21.7	17.4	4.4	17.4	4.4	21.7	13.0
16	30.4	13.0	0.0	8.7	0.0	34.8	13.0
17	21.7	21.7	8.7	13.0	0.0	30.4	4.4
18	26.1	26.1	0.0	4.4	0.0	43.5	0.0
19	43.5	39.1	0.0	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
20	17.4	30.4	4.4	4.4	21.7	13.0	8.7
21	8.7	8.7	4.4	13.0	43.5	13.0	8.7
22	17.4	30.4	0.0	4.4	13.0	17.4	17.4
23	21.7	30.4	0.0	8.7	0.0	30.4	8.7
24	8.7	13.0	0.0	21.7	43.5	4.4	8.7
25	4.4	13.0	0.0	21.7	52.2	4.4	4.4
26	8.7	39.1	0.0	13.0	34.8	0.0	4.4
27	8.7	13.0	0.0	21.7	52.2	0.0	4.4
28	26.1	39.0	4.4	4.4	17.4	8.7	0.0
29	13.0	34.8	0.0	21.7	30.4	0.0	0.0

TABLE D.9

THE EXTENT OF AGREEMENT ON DESIRED LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT (PRINCIPAL): SUMMARY

Task	Most Freq. Cited Level of Involvement Level	%	Next Most Freq. Cited Level of Involvement Level	%	Number of Levels Cited (10%)
1	Inform & Advise Supervise	30.4	Coop-Decide	21.7%	3
2	No Involve	34.8%	Inform & Advise	21.7%	4
3	Inform & Advise Coop-Decide	30.4%	No Involve Approve Outcome	13.0%	4
4	Inform & Advise	52.2%	No Involve Supervise Approve Outcome	13.0%	4
5	Inform & Advise	34.8%	No Involve Supervise	21.7%	3
6	Inform & Advise	39.1%	No Involve	30.4%	2
7	No Involve Inform & Advise	26.1%	Decide Who/How	17.4%	3
8	Supervise	43.5%	Perform Task	21.7%	4
9	Inform & Advise	43.5%	Coop-Decide	26.1%	3
10	Inform & Advise	30.4%	Coop-Decide	26.1%	4
11	No Involve	26.1%	Supervise Approve Outcome	21.7%	4
12	Inform & Advise	30.4%	Coop-Decide	21.7%	4
13	Coop-Decide	39.1%	Inform & Advise	21.7%	3
14	No Involve	39.1%	Supervise Approve Outcome	17.4%	3
15	No Involve Supervise	21.7%	Inform & Advise Coop-Decide	17.4%	5
16	Supervise	34.8%	No Involve	30.4%	4
17	Supervise	30.4%	No Involve Inform & Advise	21.7%	4
18	Supervise	43.5%	No Involve Inform & Advise	26.1%	3
19	No Involve	43.5%	Inform & Advise	39.1%	2
20	Inform & Advise	30.4%	Perform Task	21.7%	4
21	Perform Task	43.5%	Coop-Decide Supervise	13.0%	3
22	Inform & Advise	30.4%	No Involve Supervise Approve Outcome	17.4%	5
23	Inform & Advise Supervise	30.4%	No Involve	21.7%	3
24	Perform Task	43.5%	Coop-Decide	21.7%	3
25	Perform Task	52.2%	Coop-Decide	21.7%	3
26	Inform & Advise	39.1%	Perform Task	34.8%	3
27	Perform Task	52.2%	Coop-Decide	21.7%	3
28	Inform & Advise	39.0%	No Involve	26.1%	3
29	Inform & Advise	34.8%	Perform Task	30.4%	4

VII. Satisfaction with the Perceived Actual Level of Involvement

(To what extent are principals and other staff members satisfied with their present level of involvement in the accomplishment of each of the tasks? Are principals more or less satisfied then other staff members?)

One measure of the degree of satisfaction held by organizational members toward the operating procedures of their organization is the discrepancy between how they would like to see the system operate and how they actually see it operating. On a more personal level, this concept corresponds to the descrepancy between their perceived actual and desired levels of involvement in relevant organizational tasks. As discussed earlier (see Sections IV and V), role theory speaks to the relationship between this type of staff satisfaction and system performance, but the relationship is complex.

Two indicators of the degree of satisfaction held by organizational members toward their level of involvement in delivery services to exceptional children are provided. Once again, the role of the principal is highlighted. First, for the reader's convenience, Table D.10 displays the most frequently cited levels of actual and desired involvement of principals. Presumably, the greater the congruence between these two modal choices for each task, the higher the degree of satisfaction among principals (and the less likely they are to advocate the modification of their role in the delivery system). A second measure of satisfaction was formed by calculating the percentage of respondents whose desired and actual levels of involvement were identical (see Section V for further details). Table D.11 presents this indicator for principals and for all other respondents. Once again, the higher

the percentage, the higher the degree of satisfaction among the respondents with their present level of involvement in the delivery system. The relative degree of satisfaction of principals can be obtained by comparing the two sets of entries of Table D.11.

TABLE D.10

THE MOST FREQUENTLY CITED LEVELS OF ACTUAL AND DESIRED INVOLVEMENT OF PRINCIPALS (N=23)

Task	Most Freq. Cited Level of Involvement Level	%	Next Most Freq. Cited Level of Involvement Level	%
1	Inform & Advise	30.4	Inform & Advise Supervise	30.4
2	No Involve	43.5	No Involve	34.8
3	Coop-Decide	39.1	Inform & Advise Coop-Decide	30.4
4	Inform & Advise	47.8	Inform & Advise	52.2
5	Inform & Advise	34.8	Inform & Advise	34.8
6	Inform & Advise	39.1	Inform & Advise	39.1
7	No Involve Inform & Advise	30.4	No Involve Inform & Advise	26.1
8	Supervise	39.1	Supervise	43.5
9	Inform & Advise	52.2	Inform & Advise	43.5
10	Inform & Advise	39.1	Inform & Advise	30.4
11	Involve	39.1	No Involve	26.1
12	Inform & Advise	34.8	Inform & Advise	30.4
13	Coop-Decide	39.1	Coop-Decide	39.1
14	No Involve	43.5	No Involve	39.1
15	No Involve	26.1	No Involve Supervise	21.7
16	No Involve	39.1	Supervise	34.8
17	No Involve	34.8	Supervise	30.4
18	No Involve Supervise	39.1	Supervise	43.5
19	No Involve	52.2	No Involve	43.5
20	Inform & Advise	34.8	Inform & Advise	30.4
21	Perform Task	39.1	Perform Task	43.5
22	No Involve Inform & Advise	26.1	Inform & Advise	30.4
23	Inform & Advise	34.8	Inform & Advise Supervise	30.4
24	Perform Task	39.1	Perform Task	43.5
25	Perform Task	52.2	Perform Task	52.2
26	Perform Task	34.8	Inform & Advise	39.1
27	Perform Task	47.8	Perform Task	52.2
28	No Involve Inform & Advise	34.8	Inform & Advise	39.0
29	Inform & Advise	34.8	Inform & Advise	34.8

TABLE D.11

SATISFACTION WITH PERCEIVED ACTUAL LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT: PRINCIPALS AND ALL OTHER STAFF

Task	Percent of Principals (N=23)	Percent of All Other Staff (N=89)
1	69.6	76.1
2	78.3	66.7
3	82.6	90.8
4	73.9	81.6
5	91.3	82.4
6	87.0	80.7
7	81.8	77.0
8	82.6	79.1
9	78.3	86.2
10	78.3	81.4
11	69.6	84.7
12	82.6	91.9
13	82.6	88.2
14	87.0	88.0
15	87.0	81.9
16	82.6	87.1
17	78.3	87.1
18	78.3	92.9
19	91.3	78.8
20	82.6	90.5
21	91.3	83.1
22	87.0	86.7
23	87.0	85.7
24	91.3	78.3
25	91.3	75.9
26	87.0	84.7
27	91.3	85.7
28	87.0	75.0
29	87.0	84.0